



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/542,243	04/03/2000	Arthur W. Wang	PD-990212	4723

20991 7590 02/13/2003

HUGHES ELECTRONICS CORPORATION
PATENT DOCKET ADMINISTRATION
BLDG 001 M/S A109
P O BOX 956
EL SEGUNDO, CA 902450956

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHI Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3635

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/542,243

Applicant(s)

WANG, ARTHUR W.

Examiner

Chi Q Nguyen

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 April 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 13.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/22/02 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 29-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification and the drawings only show satellite wires 26 have a first termination 28 enclosed within a radome 14 and a plurality of other second terminations 30 in the various rooms of the house. The first termination 28 is to be coupled to a satellite receiving device or antenna. Second terminations 30 are coupled to a connector 32. (Page 5, lines 11-20).

Art Unit: 3637

And also the radome 14 is shown mounted upon shingles 38 of roof 16 (fig. 3a). The second embodiment of a radome 14 is installed during the installation of roof 16 so that radome 14 is partially under shingles 38 (fig. 3b) and (page 6, lines 3-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 29-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The new added claims' limitations cite as "a third, a fourth terminations, a second radome, the mounting surface is siding..." are considered new matters.

6. Claims 30-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The independent claim's 29 preamble cites "A multiple unit building comprising:" however the dependent claims' 30-43 preamble cite "A building..." are considered indefinite.

7. Claims 58-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The independent claim's 57 preamble cites "A multiple unit satellite ready building comprising:" however the dependent claims' 58-66 preamble cite "A building..." are considered indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 21, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oliver (US 6,166,329) in view of McDonald (US 6,335,753) and DeMarre (US 6,037,912).

Oliver discloses a building pre-wired for electrical outlets including a plurality of studs 40, electrical wires 18 adjacent to studs 40, connector 10, a drywall 42 encloses from therein (figs. 3A, 3B).

Oliver's wiring is for electrical outlets and does not disclose the wires used for satellite connection and a radome enclosing the first termination.

McDonald discloses building wired for satellite 22 communication including wires (18,30) that connect the roof mounted antennae on the roof to outlets 18', 30' in the wall thus providing terminations for the wire outside the building, where wire terminating within the antenna and inside the building, where wire terminating to the connectors (TV, computer, etc.). Outlets tend to be standardized for use such as electrical or phone. Figure 3 of McDonald shows a standardized phone jack (32). This is considered to be a "universal connector".

Oliver shows that pre-wiring a house is old and well known. Although he only discloses electrical wiring, it is considered obvious in the art to pre-wire with all desired wiring

needs including satellite antenna connections as suggested by McDonald. And DeMarre teaches a profile bi-directional antenna comprises antenna 100, a radome 104, a satellite wire 113 terminating to a connector 112 (first terminator) of the antenna 100, which enclosing by the radome 104 (see figs. 1-2). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Oliver's pre-wiring with McDonald for satellite antenna connections and with DeMarre for antenna enclosing by the radome 104. The motivation for substituting the Oliver's disclosure with McDonald's satellite wire and DeMarre would have been to provide the satellite signal into the building for TV, Internet service, cellular phone, etc. and protecting the antenna from exposing to UV.

In regard to claims 19-20, combining different function jacks into one connector plate is well known in the wiring and would be obvious for Oliver's structure as modified by McDonald. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide householders or users to connect to different sources (phone line, TV, internet service, etc.) at the same connector without a need of routing wires to another terminal.

10. Claims 21-23, 25, 27, 29-39, 41-43, and 57-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oliver (US 6,166,329) in view of McDonald (US 6,335,753) and DeMarre (US 6,037,912).

Oliver, McDonald disclose the structural elements for satellite cable ready except for a radome enclosing a flat satellite and positioned within low-profile sized, color match a roof randome. DeMarre teaches a low profile bi-directional antenna comprises antenna 100, a radome 104, a satellite wire 113 terminating to a connector 112 (first terminator)

of the antenna 100, which enclosing by the radome 104. And the other end of the satellite wire 113 is inherently terminating to other connector (second terminator); the antenna 100 is mounted to a planar surface or the exterior surface of a building (col. 3, line 36-54, col. 6, line 21-42). 4. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Oliver's, McDonald's with DeMarre teaching for low profile bi-directional antenna enclosing within the radome. The suggestion for doing so would have been to provide satellite wire ready and conveniently for home and office uses, protecting the antenna from UV light and to match the roof color for cosmetically purpose, so as to blend the antenna into the roof. With regard to claims 29-37, 39, 41-43, and 57-64, Oliver, McDonald, and DeMarre teach the structural elements for the satellite cable ready as stated. Oliver, McDonald, and DeMarre do not teach explicitly the satellite wires having a third, a fourth terminations, a second connector coupled to the fourth termination, a second radome enclosing the third termination. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have more than one radomes and satellite wires connecting to more than one terminations, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working device involves only routine in the art. **St Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.**

With regards to the claim 34 the universal connector comprises a LAN (Local Area Network) jack, examiner considers McDonald or DeMarre inherently teaches this because most of satellite wires are connecting to TV service and Internet service as so-called as network.

11. Claims 24, 40, and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oliver (US 6,166,329) in view of McDonald (US 6,335,753) and DeMarre (US 6,037,912) and Radov (US 4,710,778).

Oliver, McDonald, and DeMarre teach the structural elements for satellite cable ready for building as stated. Oliver, McDonald, DeMarre do not teach the radome have a color to substantially match a surface color of the roof.

Radov teaches satellite earth station comprises a satellite 11, house roof 12, antenna 16 enclosing by a canopy or radome 40. The canopy or radome is made by strong lightweight plastic capable of transmitting high frequency microwave signals with a minimum of interference. While the plastic is preferable clear, it may be opaque and of a color to match the color of the roof 12 (col. 4, lines 21-25).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Oliver, McDonald, and DeMarre with Radov for the radome color match the roof color. The suggestion for doing so would have been to enhance the cosmetically purpose, so as to blend the antenna into the roof.

12. Claims 26, 28, 38, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oliver (6,166,329) in view of DeMarre (US 6,037,912) and Spano (US 6,204,823) and Iwamura (US 5,940,028).

Oliver and DeMarre disclose the structural elements for satellite cable ready for buildings except for antenna having remote control for positioning and variable-inclination mechanism. Spano teaches an elevation drive mechanism is mounted on the support plate and interconnects the antenna for pivoting the antenna a predetermined

angle and adjusting elevation of the antenna (see abstract). And Iwamura teaches system and method for aligning an antenna including a remote control 15, and antenna 1 (see fig. 1). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Oliver, DeMarre with Spano and Iwamura for inclination mechanism and antenna remote control. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the antenna receiving the strong signal at any angle.

13. Claims 45-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oliver (US 6,166,329), in view of DeMarre (US 6,037,912) and Spano (US 6,204,823) and Iwamura (US 5,940,028).

With regard to the method claims, Oliver, DeMarre, Spano and Iwamura teach the structural elements for the satellite cable ready except for the method of assembly or installation, examiner considers this to be the obvious method of setting up the device of claims.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 18-66 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Yu (US 6,362,794), Uematsu (US 5,689,276), Jenkin (US 6,166,700).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chi Q. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 605-1224, Monday-Thursday (7:00-5:30), Fridays off or examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached at (703) 308-2486. The fax number for the organization where this

Art Unit: 3637

application or proceeding assigned are (703) 872-9326 for regular communications and (703) 872-9327 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Chi Nguyen

CQN
2/3/03

LANNA MAI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Lanna Mai